



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/896,689	06/29/2001	Robert Jacques	ACX-135	8713
7590 03/13/2006			EXAMINER	
Cymer, Inc. Legal Dept. MS/ 4-2C			HARTMAN JR, RONALD D	
San Diego, CA			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
•			2121	

DATE MAILED: 03/13/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	09/896,689	JACQUES, ROBERT			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Ronald D. Hartman Jr.	2121			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statut Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailin earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 L 2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) This 3) Since this application is in condition for allowed closed in accordance with the practice under the second se	s action is non-final. ance except for formal matters, pro				
Disposition of Claims					
 4) Claim(s) 1-67 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) 10 is/are withdrawn 5) Claim(s) 1-9 and 12-67 is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 11 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or 	from consideration.				
Application Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accomplicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	cepted or b) objected to by the lead of a cepted or b) for objected to by the lead of a cepted of the drawing o	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 					
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:				

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter, which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

As per claim 11, the claim refers to "The system of claim 10 ...", but since there is no claim 10, since it was canceled, it stands to reason that there is not proper antecedent basis for the preamble of this claim. For examination purposes, it will be assumed that claim 11 should depend from claim 1.

Allowable Subject Matter

2. Claim 11 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims and claims 1-9 and 12-67 are allowed.

As per claims 1-9 and 11-67, the prior art of record fails to teach a system for controlling the physical behavior of an apparatus, wherein an initial model of the system is adapted to provide an updated model and wherein a transfer function is utilized for this purpose, and wherein the updated model is combined with a universal filter in order to create a relation that describes the behavior of the apparatus and which allows for the creation of a controller based on the described relation such that the controller is tuned according to the updated model, in combination with the other claimed features and or limitations as claimed.

The "universal filter" has been interpreted to be representative of the filter described by way of pending claim 6 and which is also shown on page 13 of the applicants specification, and its utilization, in combination with the amended features

Application/Control Number: 09/896,689 Page 3

Art Unit: 2121

including the utilization of the transfer function of the respective acquired data for the basis for the determination of allowable subject matter.

Examiner Note

3. The applicant is kindly asked to submit a clean set of claims which allows for the equations of claims 6, 21, 45, 53-58 and 64-67 to be better represented since they are very blurry in the fax transmissions submitted to the Office. They are sufficient for examination purposes but will be difficult to reproduce during publishing and therefore the applicant is kindly asked to submit a clean, legible version of the claims in response to this Notice Of Allowance.

Conclusion

4. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ronald D. Hartman Jr. whose telephone number is (571) 272-3684. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Fri., 11:00 - 8:30 pm, EST.

Art Unit: 2121

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Anthony Knight can be reached on (571) 272-3687. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Ronald D Hartman Jr.

Patent Examiner

Art Unit 2121

RDH

March 6, 2006

XRDH

Anthony Knight

Supervisory Patent Examiner

Group 3600